

Toms Coffee House Jan<sup>y</sup> 7<sup>th</sup> 1729

No. 28

---

Mr Wragg  
Goldha  
Davie  
Bullo  
Mason

THE  
ADVOCATES  
FOR A  
PLACE-BILL  
DETECTED, &c.

---

Price Sixpence

ADVOCATES  
THE

PLACÉ-BILL

DETECTED, 64.

P4

THE  
ADVOCATES  
FOR A  
PLACE-BILL  
DETECTED,

In that False and Impudent Assertion,

*That the Whigs, in the Reign of King  
WILLIAM, were the Authors and Pro-  
moters of that Clause in the Act of Settle-  
ment, viz. That no Person, who hath  
an Office, or Place of Profit, or Pension  
from the Crown, shall be capable of  
serving as a Member of the House of  
Commons.*

---

*I hope that no Person, who affects to be a Friend to the  
Revolution, or is really so, will make any Objection  
against quoting from Bishop Burnet, the Opinion which  
the Whigs had of that Proceeding.*

Craftsman, Dec. 22. 1739.

---

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. ROBERTS, near the Oxford-  
Arms in Warwick-Lane. MDCCL.

in some Falls and impudent Affliction,

That the Whigs, in the Reign of King  
 William, were the Authors and Pro-  
 moters of that Party in the City of Scot-  
 land, viz. That a Person, who hath  
 an Office, or Place of Profit, or Pension  
 from the Crown, shall be capable of  
 serving as a Member of the House of  
 Commons.

Christian, Dec. 1, 1871



Printed for J. R. ...  
... in ...



( I )



THE  
ADVOCATES  
FOR A  
PLACE-BILL  
DETECTED, &c.

**I**N all Debates and Writings concerning the Reasonableness and Necessity of a *Place-Bill*, it has, with a great Air of Triumph, been constantly asserted by the Advocates for such a Bill, — That the Whigs in King *William's* Reign were the Contrivers and chief Promoters of that Clause in the

Act of Settlement, which excludes all Persons in Places of Profit from serving as Members of Parliament; and that they acted upon this Principle, — That the Constitution was not safe without such a Clause of Limitations.

At a Time therefore, when it is publicly declared, by very good Authority, that a *Place-Bill* is designed to be brought into Parliament; it is very proper and necessary, that this Affair should be set in a true Light, and that all Men may see, — who were the Contrivers and Promoters of that Clause in the Act of Settlement. — For what Reasons that Clause was inserted in the Bill. — And what Part the *Whigs* acted upon that Occasion.

I know no Writer, who has given so full and minute an Account of this Transaction, as Bishop *Burnet* has done in the History of his own Time.

To that worthy Prelate, therefore, let us appeal, and see with what Regard to Truth the Advocates for a *Place-Bill* have so roundly asserted, as if it was an incontestable Fact; — That the *Whigs* were the Contrivers and chief Promoters of that Clause

Claufe of Limitations in the Act of Settlement; when it is evident from *Burnet*, and indeed from the whole History of those Times; — That, when the Act of Settlement passed, the *Tories* were not only at the Helm, and the chief Persons in the Administration, but that Party was likewise a great Majority in the House of Commons. — That they used all their Art and Skill to delay the passing of that Bill; and when they found that was not to be done, they clogged it with Limitations, on Purpose to raise a Dispute between the two Houses, and by that Means to have the Bill lost. — And, that the *Whigs* complied with those Limitations, not as they approved of them, but purely because they were glad to have the Act passed any Way, when they plainly saw the Danger there was of losing it, and because they thought those Limitations might be better considered at another Time.

This is the Truth. And how very different is this from those false Representations, which have been given of this Affair by the Advocates for a *Place-Bill*.

It has constantly been asserted by these Men; — That a *Place-Bill* was not only founded

founded upon *Whig* Principles, but that it was perfectly conformable to the Sentiments of the *Old Whigs*; and that therefore it was a Reproach to every Man, who affected to be thought a *Whig*, or was really such, to oppose those Limitations, which the *Whigs*, in King *William's* Reign, judged of absolute Necessity for the Safety and Preservation of the Constitution.

And the Assurance, with which this has been asserted, has made it generally believed; and few, if any, have given themselves the Trouble, to examine into the Truth of it.

Now, though it be certain, that the Opinion of any single Person, or Body of Men, ought no farther to determine any Man's Judgment, than it has Reason on its Side; and that the same Law may be very just and necessary, and, on the contrary, as hurtful and dangerous, at different Times; yet as Men are too apt to be led away by the Opinion of their own Party, and are unwilling, or ashamed to be thought to act in Contradiction to the Conduct of those, whose Memories they have in great Veneration, I shall therefore shew from Bishop *Burnet*. these two things:

1. That



1. That the *Tories* were the *sole* Contrivers and Promoters of that Clause in the Act of Settlement, with this View chiefly, to *defeat* the Bill itself.

2. That the *Whigs* comply'd with that Clause, not as they *approv'd* of it, but as they were glad to have the Act pass'd any way, when they saw the Danger of *losing* it from the Conduct and Designs of the *Tories*.

This is so strongly set forth by *Burnet*, that no Words can make it plainer.

I shall set down the whole that he has said upon this Subject, because nothing can be a more true and lively Description of Parties amongst us at this Time; and that the whole Nation, and particularly the *Whigs*, may be convinced, that as they were the *Tories* who contrived that Clause of Limitations; so it is the same Party who are now so clamorous for a Place-Bill: And shall submit it to the Judgment of every serious unprejudic'd Man, Whether that Party, who were the Contrivers of that Clause for the vilest and most destructive Purposes, must not have some vile and wicked Views in their Endeavours to

B

promote

promote a Bill of the same Nature with that Clause, in this critical Conjunction.

“ The declaring (says *Burnet*) a Protestant Successor, after the Princess, and such Issue as she might have, seemed to be forgot by our Parliament, tho’ the King had begun his Speech with it. The new Ministers spoke of it with much Zeal; from this their Friends made Inferences from it in their Favour, that certainly Men in the Interest of *France*, would not promote a Design so destructive of all they drove at. This was so little of a piece with the rest of their Conduct, that those who were still jealous of their Sincerity, look’d on it as a Blind to cover their ill Designs, and to gain them some Credit. The Manner in which this Motion of the Succession was manag’d, did not carry in it great Marks of Sincerity. It was often put off from one Day to another, and it gave place to the most trifling Matters. At last, when a Day was solemnly set for it, and all People expected that it should pass without any Difficulty, *Harley* mov’d that some things previous to that might be first consider’d. He observ’d, that the Haste the Nation was in, when the present Government was  
“ settled,

“ settled, had made us go too fast, and  
 “ overlook many Securities, which might  
 “ have prevented much Mischief, and  
 “ therefore he hoped they would not now  
 “ fall into the same Error. Nothing  
 “ press’d them at present; so he mov’d  
 “ they would settle some Conditions of  
 “ Government as Preliminaries, before  
 “ they should proceed to the Nomination  
 “ of the Person; that so we might fix  
 “ every thing that was wanting to make  
 “ our Security compleat. This was po-  
 “ pular, and took with many; and it had  
 “ so fair an Appearance, that indeed none  
 “ could oppose it. Some Weeks were  
 “ spent upon it. People thought this  
 “ was done on design to blast the Motion,  
 “ and to offer such extravagant Limitati-  
 “ ons, as should quite change the Form  
 “ of our Government, and render the  
 “ Crown titular and precarious. All Men  
 “ who had Places or Pensions were made  
 “ incapable of sitting in the House of  
 “ Commons. Many who had an ill Opi-  
 “ nion of the Design of those who were  
 “ now at the Helm, began to conclude,  
 “ that the Delays were affected, and that  
 “ these Limitations were design’d to raise  
 “ Disputes between the two Houses, by  
 “ which the Bill might be lost. When  
 “ some time had been spent in these Preli-  
 B 2                      “ minaries,

“ minaries, it came to the Nomination of  
 “ the Person. Sir *John Bowles*, who was  
 “ then disorder’d in his Senses, and soon  
 “ after quite lost them, was set on by the  
 “ Party, to be the first who should name  
 “ the Electress Dowager of *Brunswick*;  
 “ which seem’d done to make it less seri-  
 “ ous, when moved by such a Person.  
 “ He was, by the Forms of the House,  
 “ put into the Chair of the Committee to  
 “ whom the Bill was committed. The  
 “ Thing was still put off for many Weeks.  
 “ At every time that it was called for, the  
 “ Motion was entertain’d with Coldness,  
 “ which served to heighten the Jealousy.  
 “ The Committee once or twice sat upon  
 “ it; but all the Members ran out of the  
 “ House with so much Indecency, that  
 “ the Contrivers seem’d ashamed of this  
 “ Management. There were seldom Fif-  
 “ ty or Sixty at the Committee; yet, in  
 “ Conclusion, it was pass’d, and sent up  
 “ to the Lords, where was expected great  
 “ Opposition would be made against it.  
 “ Some imagin’d the Act was only an Ar-  
 “ tifice, design’d to gain Credit to those,  
 “ who at this time were so ill thought of  
 “ over the Nation, that they wanted some  
 “ colourable thing to excuse their other  
 “ Proceedings. Those who wish’d well  
 “ to the Act, were glad to have it pass’d  
 “ any



“ any way, and so would not examine the  
 “ Limitations that were in it. They  
 “ thought it of great Importance to carry  
 “ the Act, and that, at another time, those  
 “ Limitations might be better consider’d.  
 “ So the Act passed. We reckon’d it a  
 “ great Point carried, that we had now a  
 “ Law on our Side for a Protestant Suc-  
 “ cessor: For we plainly saw a great Party  
 “ form’d against it, in favour of the pre-  
 “ tended *Prince of Wales*. He was now  
 “ past Thirteen, bred up with a Hatred  
 “ both of our Religion and our Constitu-  
 “ tion, in an Admiration of the *French*  
 “ Government; and yet many, who cal-  
 “ led themselves Protestants, seemed fond  
 “ of such a Successor: A Degree of Infa-  
 “ tuation that might justly amaze all who  
 “ observed it, and saw the Fury with  
 “ which it was promoted.” *Vol. II.*  
*pag. 270, 271.*

What a Scene of Villany, I can call it  
 by no other Name, does this display!  
 Surely those Men amongst us, who cannot  
 be brought to believe, that the present *To-  
 ries* have an irreconcilable Hatred to the  
 Protestant Succession, must never have  
 heard or read one Syllable of this Behavi-  
 our of the Party.

I should

I should be glad to know of those Men, who have this charitable good Opinion of the modern *Tories*, whether they ever heard one Man among them condemn this infamous Conduct of their Party.

Not to condemn such a Proceeding is the same Thing as to justify it. But it is plain from the Conduct of the Party since that Time, they have the same Aversion to the present Establishment riveted and interwoven in their very Constitution.

And shall we take these Men into our Bosoms? Shall we be fond of a Bill, which will open a Way to let these Men into the House of Commons?

We raise a Clamour against *Place-Men*; but will any Man have the Insolence to say, or is any Man so weak as to believe, that our Religion, our Liberties, and all that is dear and valuable to us, were ever in any sort of Danger, that could bear the least Similitude or Proportion to the Dangers we have providentially escaped, — *when Tories were at the Helm, — when the Tories were the Majority in the House of Commons?*

Allowing

Allowing there is Danger to Liberty from *Place-Men*, which I am far from thinking; Did ever any wise Man chuse that Part, where there is not only the greatest Probability of Danger, but where the Danger so vastly exceeds all other?

Good God! who can read the Account which *Burnet* here gives us of the Manner in which the Act of Settlement, and nominating a Protestant Successor, was treated by the *Tories*, without the utmost Indignation?

“ A Motion for nominating a Protestant  
 “ Successor entertained with Coldness;  
 “ — as often as the Committee sat, the  
 “ *Tory* Members running out of the House,  
 “ with so much Indecency, that the Con-  
 “ trivers seemed ashamed of it, — fel-  
 “ dom Fifty or Sixty at the Committee,  
 “ so few of the *Whig* Party was there in  
 “ that Parliament; — and to com-  
 “ plete the Farce, Sir *John Bowles*, a Man  
 “ disordered in his Senses, and who soon  
 “ after quite lost them, was set on by the  
 “ *Tories*, to be the first that should name  
 “ the Electress Dowager of *Brunswick*, to  
 “ make it less serious, when moved by  
 “ such a Person.”

Any

Any Man would be inclined to look upon this as a Romance or a Banter upon the Party, did it not come from the Pen of one, who, as he was not afraid to speak the Truth, so he would not dare to transmit to Posterity, what he knew to be false.

And notwithstanding this, this is the Party, who acted this vile Scene; in behalf of whom, *Instructions*, as they are impudently and ridiculously called, are sent up from several Parts of the Kingdom, to recommend them as the only fit Persons to serve as Members of Parliament.

But farther; Is there one Word in what I have here quoted from *Burnet*, that shews it to have been the Opinion of the *Whigs* at that Time, — That it was absolutely necessary, for the Safety and Preservation of the Constitution, to exclude Men in Offices of Profit from sitting in the House of Commons?

On the contrary, Was it not the Opinion of the *Whigs*, as *Burnet* observes, —  
 “ That such Limitations tended to change  
 “ entirely the Form of our Government,  
 “ and render the Crown titular and precarious?  
 And



And is it not as plain, that they had never agreed to the passing of the Act with those Limitations, "but that they were  
 "glad to have it passed any Way, when  
 "they saw so great a Party formed against  
 "it in Favour of the pretended Prince of  
 "*Wales.*"

These were the Consequences, which the *Whigs* in that Reign judged would be the Effect of such Limitations, as are proposed by a *Place-Bill*. And it is the Height of Impudence in the Advocates for such a Bill to call in the Act of Settlement in Support of it, when in Truth it is the strongest Argument against it.

The *Tories* indeed did not so much design by that Clause to make an immediate Alteration in the Constitution, as to defeat the Act of Settlement itself, and to prevent the Nomination of a Successor. This was what they had all along in View. But, as the Ministry was composed of *Tories*, and the King had recommended it from the Throne, they could not, as they were at that Time so ill thought of over the Nation, avoid bringing in the Bill; but it is plain from their whole Conduct, that they resolved if possible to prevent the passing of it; and, for that Reason chiefly, tho' no  
 C doubt

doubt they had the Change of the Constitution in view, inserted that Clause.

This is the true History of that Clause. And to borrow the Words of the *Craftsman*, Dec. 22. 1739. " —I hope that no  
 " Person, who affects to be a Friend to  
 " the Revolution, or is really so, will  
 " make any Objection against quoting from  
 " *Burnet* the Opinion which the Friends  
 " to the Revolution had of that Proceed-  
 " ing."

If the Bishop has not truly and faithfully represented the Opinion which the *Whigs*, or Friends to the Revolution, had of that Clause, if he has charg'd the *Tories* wrongfully, let this Writer confute him.

But if he cannot do this; if *Burnet* has given us a faithful Relation of the Conduct of both Parties at that Time; Is it not a Shame for this Writer, or for any Man who pretends to act according to the Principles of the old *Whigs*, to insist upon that Clause as a Reason for a *Place-Bill*?

Hence it appears, how ridiculous and false it is to charge the *Whigs*, who declare their Dislike of a *Place-Bill*, with a  
 I Change

Change of Principles, and acting in Contradiction to the *Whigs* in the Reign of King *William*; when it is certain, that had those *Whigs* liv'd in these Days they wou'd have oppos'd a *Place-Bill*, upon the very same Principle, as they declar'd their Dislike of that Clause, "as thinking it wou'd quite change the Form of our Government, and render the Crown titular and precarious."

But it is too much to be suspected, that many who would rank themselves under the Denomination of *Whigs* in these Days, are in truth mere *Republicans*; and that the true Reason of their being so anxious for this Bill is, — That they would preserve nothing but the *Name* of Monarchy, without any of those *Powers* which have always been annex'd to the Crown; much after the same Model as we now see the Power of the Crown reduc'd in *Sweden*.

The Advocates for a *Place-Bill* themselves cannot deny, but that such an Act would be an Alteration of the Constitution. But how weak and trifling is their Excuse for this?

"To say that this is an Alteration of the Constitution, (says the *Craftsman*,  
C 2 "Dec.

“ Dec. 29. 1739.) is saying no more than  
 “ that every publick Act is an Alteration,  
 “ as far as the Force of that Act reaches.”

Very true: But the Question is, How  
*far* the Force of a *Place-Bill* will reach?  
 It is not *barely* making an Alteration, that  
 is the Thing complain'd of; but the ma-  
 king *such* an Alteration, as will lodge so  
 much Power in the House of Commons,  
 “ as to quite change the Form of our Go-  
 “ vernment, and render the Crown titular  
 “ and precarious;” which was the Opini-  
 on of the old *Whigs*, as I shall prove more  
 particularly hereafter.

The same Writer goes on, and tells us:  
 “ —Several Laws have been made from  
 “ time to time, with relation to Places.  
 “ Some of them were thought too rigid,  
 “ and therefore have been repeal'd or a-  
 “ mended. But all these Transactions  
 “ shew the Danger which was apprehend-  
 “ ed from *Place-Men*.”

This Gentleman cannot be suppos'd not  
 to have read *Burnet's History*, or to be ig-  
 norant of the Transactions at the passing  
 of the Act of Settlement, and therefore it  
 is a Shame for him to speak thus.

Did



Did those Transactions shew the *Danger* that was apprehended from *Place-Men*? Apprehended by whom? By the *Whigs*? That he will not say. Was it by the *Tories*? Is it not Fact, that they thrust that Clause against *Place-Men* into the Bill, not from any *Danger* they apprehended from *Place-Men*, but purely with a Design to defeat the Bill.

As their Design was to have the Bill lost, so they judged the most likely Method to effect that, was to insert a Clause, which would subvert the Constitution, in Hopes it would raise Disputes between the two Houses.

The *Tories* at that Time must think that Clause a very bad one in its own Nature, or it would not have served the Purpose they intended by it, to have the Bill lost.

Thus we see, in the first Instance of a *Place-Bill*, whatever the *Tories* might pretend, they had no Apprehension of any *Danger* from *Place-Men*, nor was that Consideration any Motive with them for inserting that Clause in the Bill.

Besides, if the Danger was so great as is now pretended, Why was not that Clause  
to

to be in Force, till the Act of Succession took place? They had indeed a very good Reason for this, because at that Time they had engross'd most of the Places to themselves. And after their open and daring Attempts to defeat the Revolution in the first place, and after that the Protestant Succession, they had very little ground to hope, that, when the Succession took place, any Confidence should be plac'd in them, as it unfortunately had been by King *William*.

But it ought not to be conceal'd, the Pretences which *Burnet* tells us they made for inserting that Clause.

It was said by Mr. *Harley*,—— “ That  
 “ the Haste the Nation was in, when the  
 “ Government was settled at the Time of  
 “ the Revolution, had made them overlook many Securities, which might have  
 “ prevented much Mischief; and therefore he hoped they would fix every thing  
 “ that was wanting to make our Security  
 “ compleat.”

King *William* had reign'd twelve Years before this Pretence was started. And I should be glad to know of any Man,—— what those Mischiefs were, during those  
 twelve

twelve Years, which required that Clause to prevent them.

That Prince, with all the Power he was entrusted, was never able to take the Field against the common Enemy, till they had well nigh executed all their Designs, and the Scene of Action was so far over that it was almost impossible for him to undertake any Thing of Consequence.

Here was a Mischief indeed, and the Nation feels the unhappy Effects of it to this Day. A Mischief, that proceeded, as did all the Mischiefs of that Reign, from the unhappy Choice that Prince made of his Ministers.

I will not say that this Mischief might have been prevented, if many Securities had not been overlooked; or that some Expedient ought to have been resolved upon at that Time, by which the King might have been restrained from making such a fatal Choice of his Ministers.

No. The Power of the Crown, in the Choice of its Ministers and in the Distribution of its Favours, ought to be untrouled. I do not mean, that this should put it out of the Power of a Parliament to  
call

call any Ministry to an Account for their Conduct. But should this Power of the Disposition of Places be separated from the Crown, it will most certainly have this Effect, “ to render the Crown titular and “ precarious.”

King *William* had it in his Power to have prevented this and all the other Mischiefs of his Reign; but his Misfortune was, that he employed a Party, who were determined to render his Reign burthensome and unsuccessful, and consequently odious to the People.

And whilst there are two Parties of different Interests in this Nation, which will, I fear, always be our Condition, the Prince will ever be liable to make a wrong Choice of his Ministers.

It was so in King *William's* Reign. It was the same at the End of the Reign of *Q. Anne*. And may it not as well be argued, that, because very great and fatal Mischiefs attended the Choice of the Ministry in those two Reigns, therefore some Expedient ought to be found out to exclude that Party, who are justly to be suspected of not being in the Interest of their Country, from serving their Prince in that Capacity.

This



This would be thought very hard, and yet the Reasoning is the same in this Case, as in the other of debarring the Prince from disposing of Places to Members of the House of Commons.

The Truth is, the Prince ought either to be under no Restraint in the disposing of Places, or he ought to have no Power to dispose of any Places. And it would most certainly end in this at last, as we see it has done in *Sweden*; — That, if once the Prince be laid under any Restrictions in this Matter, it will soon terminate in this, that the Power of disposing of Places will be absolutely taken from him.

And thus by an Expedient to preserve the Constitution, it shall be quite altered and changed.

And let the Advocates for a *Place-Bill* pretend what they please by such a Bill, This is at the Bottom of all — To take all Places out of the Hands of the Crown.

Let them therefore speak out, and declare, that they are of Opinion the Constitution ought to be changed in this Part of it; and then Men will better be able

D

to

to judge of the Good or Evil of such a Bill.

But it will be said perhaps, — That whilst a House of Commons is kept free from the Influence of the Crown, there can be no Danger from the Prince's making a bad Choice of his Ministers.

This is far from being the Truth. But supposing it were true, are *Place-Men* the only Men that are to be excluded the House of Commons? Have we not a powerful Party amongst us, who are far from being in the Interest of their Country? Men, who, if they are not in the Interest of the *Pretender*, have an irreconcilable Hatred to the Protestant Succession; and who, if once they were the Majority in a House of Commons, would distress the Government, just as the *Tories* did in almost all the Parliaments of King *William*.

And I shall be glad to know of any Man, whether the Exclusion of *Place-Men* will not unavoidably give these Men, whom no Oaths can bind, an Opportunity to become the Majority in the House of Commons.

This is the great Evil of a *Place-Bill*, which as it is impracticable to remedy, so  
it

it exposes the Folly and Mischief of such a Bill.

And it is evident from *Burnet*, that the *Whigs* in King *William's* Reign apprehended this would be the Consequence of that Clause in the Act of Settlement, which was one Reason of their declaring their Abhorrence of it.

The other Reason of their Dislike to that Clause was, that they judg'd it to be a dangerous Alteration of the Constitution.

*Burnet* tells us, — “ That they thought  
“ the Design of the *Tories*, in inserting  
“ that Clause, was to change quite the  
“ Form of our Government, and render  
“ the Crown titular and precarious.”

And if this had not been their Opinion, why should they express such a Dislike to that Clause, when it was not to be in force till the *Hanover* Succession took place?

It might possibly have happen'd, that, before that Time came, most of the *Tories* then living might be dead, or that the Party might be better reconcil'd to the Protestant Succession.

But tho' they had little Reason to expect such a Change of Principles in the *Tories*; yet it is plain they were of Opinion, that supposing that to be the Case, yet the laying the Crown under such Restrictions would quite change the Form of Government.

Nor can any other possible Reason be given of their Dislike to the Limitations in that Clause, which were not to take place for some Years, but that they were of Opinion the Crown ought *never* to be made subject to such Limitations; and that such Limitations were invented by Men, who design'd nothing less by them, but either to overturn the Government, or to make a Change in the Form of it.

Their declaring their Disapprobation of that Clause, when it was not to be in force for some Years, is a Demonstration, that they thought it *never* ought to be in force.

It is plain, they thought the Clause an *Alteration* in the Constitution, as indeed it must be; for whatever is made a *Part* of the Constitution, that was not so *before*, is making an *Alteration* in the Constitution.



And yet the Writer in the *Craftsman*, Dec. 22. 1739. asks this ridiculous Question, —Whether an Act to limit the Number of *Place-Men* in the House of Commons will be so great an Alteration of the Constitution, as the Repeal of that Clause was?

Which is just as wise, as if he had ask'd, —Whether the making any thing a Part of the Constitution, which was not so before, and which is consequently an Alteration of the Constitution, be as great an Alteration of the Constitution, as the Repeal of that which was no Part of the Constitution, and consequently could be no Alteration of it? Or, in other Words, —Whether the making an Alteration in the Constitution be as great an Alteration of it, as that which is no Alteration, but only the restoring of it?

For as the Clause was no Part of the Constitution, the Repeal of it could be no Alteration.

And I should be glad to know of this Writer, — whether he does not in his Conscience believe, that the *Whigs* in King *William's* Reign declared their Dislike of that Clause because they were of Opinion  
the

But tho' they had little Reason to expect such a Change of Principles in the *Tories*; yet it is plain they were of Opinion, that supposing that to be the Case, yet the laying the Crown under such Restrictions would quite change the Form of Government.

Nor can any other possible Reason be given of their Dislike to the Limitations in that Clause, which were not to take place for some Years, but that they were of Opinion the Crown ought *never* to be made subject to such Limitations; and that such Limitations were invented by Men, who design'd nothing less by them, but either to overturn the Government, or to make a Change in the Form of it.

Their declaring their Disapprobation of that Clause, when it was not to be in force for some Years, is a Demonstration, that they thought it *never* ought to be in force.

It is plain, they thought the Clause an *Alteration* in the Constitution, as indeed it must be; for whatever is made a *Part* of the Constitution, that was not so *before*, is making an *Alteration* in the Constitution.

And yet the Writer in the *Craftsman*, Dec. 22. 1739. asks this ridiculous Question, —Whether an Act to limit the Number of *Place-Men* in the House of Commons will be so great an Alteration of the Constitution, as the Repeal of that Clause was?

Which is just as wise, as if he had ask'd, —Whether the making any thing a Part of the Constitution, which was not so before, and which is consequently an Alteration of the Constitution, be as great an Alteration of the Constitution, as the Repeal of that which was no Part of the Constitution, and consequently could be no Alteration of it? Or, in other Words, —Whether the making an Alteration in the Constitution be as great an Alteration of it, as that which is no Alteration, but only the restoring of it?

For as the Clause was no Part of the Constitution, the Repeal of it could be no Alteration.

And I should be glad to know of this Writer, — whether he does not in his Conscience believe, that the *Whigs* in King *William's* Reign declared their Dislike of that Clause, because they were of Opinion  
the

the Crown ought never to be subject to those Limitations.

Had that Clause been to take place immediately, their Opposition to it might possibly arise from hence, — That they judged it was not *then* a proper Time for such Limitations. But when those Limitations were not to be in Force for some Years, it is a plain Demonstration that they judged they *never* ought to be in Force.

If this be the Truth, and will admit of no Reply, Is it not the Height of Insolence or Stupidity in the Advocates for a *Place-Bill* to plead this Clause in the Act of Settlement, as an unanswerable Reason for such a Bill, and that a *Place-Bill* is agreeable to the Sentiments of the *Old Whigs*?

Thus have I made it plainly appear, — That the famous Clause of Limitations in the Act of Settlement was purely and solely the Contrivance of the *Tories*; — That it was inserted in that Act, with a Design to raise Disputes between the two Houses, by which the Bill might be lost; or if that should not happen, that they hoped by those Limitations to change the Form of our Government, and to render the Crown titular and precarious. — And, that the



the *Whigs* perceiving their Design to defeat the Bill itself, and to blast the Motion of nominating a Protestant Successor; and that all this was done in Favour of the pretended Prince of *Wales*, to a Degree of Infatuation, that amazed all who observed it, and saw the Fury with which it was promoted; that when the *Whigs* plainly saw this, though they could not but declare their utter dislike of those Limitations, yet they would not directly oppose or enter into the Examination of them at that Time; being glad to have the Act passed any Way, and thinking those Limitations might be better considered another Time; it being of the utmost Consequence to have a Law passed for a Protestant Successor.

And notwithstanding these are Facts not to be contested, yet such is the Assurance of the Advocates for a *Place-Bill*, that they go on to triumph in that Clause, alledging it to have been inserted in the Act of Settlement by the unanimous Consent of both Parties, and particularly of the *Whigs*, as a farther and necessary Establishment of the Constitution, and what was overlooked at the Revolution; and, in Consequence of this, charging the modern *Whigs* with acting in direct Contradiction to *Whig* Principles,

ples, and the Sentiments of the *Old Whigs*, by their Opposition to a *Place-Bill*.

This is such a Scene of Hypocrisy and Wickedness, as must amaze all who see and know it; and therefore it is fit and necessary, that it should no longer lye concealed, but be exposed to the view of the whole Nation.

And if, after this, any *Whig*, or any Man whatsoever, who is a Friend to the present Establishment, can desire or endeavour to have a *Place-Bill* passed, in the present Circumstances of Parties, and of the Nation in general; — That Man must, I think, be infatuated to such a Degree, as to make him incapable of being convinced by Reason and Argument, or indeed by any Thing less, than that *Ruin*, which such a Bill would most inevitably bring upon his Country.



**FINIS.**

